

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 6 is herein amended. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

The examiner noted that claim 6 fails to clarify what standard is being used for comparison and the specification continues to lack criteria by which one may determine which mesh sizes are included and which are excluded.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite, among other things, “wherein said screen has a mesh size of 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.” Because each ink specifies the mesh number for ordinary screen printing of said ink, a person of ordinary skill in the art would easily determine which mesh sizes are included and which are excluded in the present invention.

Thus, the rejection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Saint Victor (US Patent No. 6,211,308 B1) in view of Tugwell (U.S. Patent No. 4,037,008 A).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Responding to Applicant’s previous response, the Examiner commented as follows:

Applicant has not addressed the specific argument of the Examiner: that mesh size is a result-effective variable. Further, Applicant has presented no evidence demonstrating the criticality of the claimed mesh size. Consequently, the Examiner's position remains unchanged.

(Office Action, item 6).

As already mentioned, claim 6 has been amended to recite, among other things, “wherein said screen has a mesh size of 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

Admitting that Saint Victor does not teach the use of a screen having a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size, the Examiner alleged that Tugwell teaches that the mesh size is a result-effective variable and may be adjusted depending upon the viscosity of the ink utilized as well as the thickness and degree of detail desired. However, each ink specifies mesh size for ordinary screen printing. Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that mesh size is a result-effective variable, nothing indicates that the screen has a mesh size of 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink. Tugwell is discussing the ordinary standard screen printing, and nothing indicates that the screen has a mesh size much coarser than a standard mesh size specified for ordinary screen printing of the ink.

Thus, Saint Victor and Tugwell does not teach or suggest “wherein said screen has a mesh size of 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

For at least these reasons, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Saint Victor and Tugwell. Claim 7-10, depending from claim 6 also patentably distinguishes over Saint Victor and Tugwell for at least the same reasons.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/541,898
Art Unit: 1792

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.116
Attorney Docket No.: 052788

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Sadao Kinashi
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,075
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/kn